

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-9 have been amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph; Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Blanchard et al.; and Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Baker et al.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-3 have been amended to identify that the stored information originates from the calling subscriber and is contained within the text message. Claim 5 has been amended to indicate that the message refers to the text message. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Blanchard et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a procedure to transmit information in connection with a telephone answering service that transmits a text message containing stored information in parallel to the called subscriber when the called subscriber establishes a wireless connection to listen to recorded speech messages. Independent Claim 9 recites similar features.

In a non-limiting example, the specification states "A-numbers are transmitted, not as previously at notification, but at the listening to the messages. This is done via SMS or USSD (Unstructured Supplementary Services Data) which uses signaling channels which

transfer information in parallel with the speech service” (see page 4, line 26). That is, the specification discusses not to transmit stored information upon notification, but rather to transmit stored information in parallel with the speech service. An advantage of this approach is that “the telephone number from calling subscriber is transmitted to the voice mailbox subscriber via SMS or USSD, at the same time as the subscriber listens to recorded mobile answer messages” (see page 6, lines 13-16).

Blanchard does not describe transmission of stored information in parallel with transmission of speech messages. Rather, Blanchard describes stored information sent to a subscriber terminal upon notification (column 4, lines 50-54).

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent Claims 1 and 9 and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Baker et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Baker et al. has a filing date of December 23, 1998, which is later than the filing date of the claimed foreign priority application 9800483-1 filed on February 19, 1998. Therefore, to overcome this rejection, an English translation of 9800483-1 is enclosed.


In addition, Claims 4, 6, 7 and 8 have been amended to correct minor cosmetic informalities.

Application No. 09/622,593
Reply to Office action of: March 31, 2003

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER AND NEUSTADT, P.C.


Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Attorney of Record
David A. Bilodeau
Registration No. 42,325



22850

Tel.: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
GJM:DAB:ZS/dnf

I:\ATTYZS\194667US\194667US-AM.DOC